

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

GREGORY LANGADINOS,

Plaintiff,

v.

WASHINGTON STATE BAR
ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON
STATE BAR ASSOCIATION BOARD
OF GOVERNORS, LISA
AMATANGEL, JULIE SHANKLAND,
WASHINGTON STATE SUPREME
COURT,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-250

ORDER

On April 30, 2024, Plaintiff Gregory Langadinos moved to amend his complaint, and the Clerk properly noted the motion for consideration on May 21, 2024. Dkt. No. 47. Defendants Washington State Bar Association (WSBA) and Washington State Supreme Court responded on May 13, 2024, and May 15, 2024, respectively. Dkt. Nos. 50, 53. Langadinos failed to reply by May 21, 2024. Instead, a week later on May 27, 2024, he moved for “an extension of time.” Dkt. No. 56. The WSBA and State Supreme Court objected. Dkt. No. 57. Then, on May 29,

1 Langadinos filed a “preliminary” reply in support of his motion to amend. Dkt. No.
2 59.

3 Although Langadinos proceeds pro se, he must follow the Local Civil Rules of
4 this Court. *United States v. \$15,333.00 in U.S. Currency*, 988 F. Supp. 2d 1229,
5 1234 (D. Or. 2013) (citing *Jacobsen v. Filler*, 790 F.2d 1362, 1364-65 (9th Cir.1986))
6 (“[Pro se litigants] have a duty to comply with the applicable rules of civil procedure
7 and court orders.”). A reply in response to a motion to amend must be “filed and
8 received by the opposing party no later than 21 days after the filing date of the
9 motion.” LCR 7(d)(3). Langadinos failed to file his reply or move for an extension of
10 time before May 21, 2024, as required by LCR 7(d)(3).

11 Langadinos appears to misunderstand the Local Civil Rules, stating he
12 “believes his [r]epley is due Tuesday May 28, 2024.” Dkt. No. 56 at 2. Langadinos
13 argues that he needed an extension until May 31, 2024, because he “must fly to
14 Boston, Massachusetts this Tuesday May 28, 2024, due to [his] [m]other’s admission
15 into [the] Intensive Care unit of Massachusetts General Hospital.” Dkt. No. 56 at 2.

16 Defendants jointly oppose an extension. They argue that Langadinos fails to
17 show good cause and excusable neglect under Rule 6(b)(2) because
18 misunderstanding a rule is not an excuse. Dkt. No. 57 at 4-5. Defendants further
19 argue extending the deadline will delay resolution of the case to their detriment,
20 and that Langadinos demonstrates continued disregard of Court rules. *Id.* at 6
21 (citing *Phillips v. KIRO-TV, Inc.*, 817 F. Supp. 2d 1317, 1323 (W.D. Wash. 2011)).

22 This case is distinguishable from *Phillips*. In that case the pro se plaintiff
23 failed to respond to a motion to dismiss even though the court “set a date certain for

1 his opposition” and warned him no further extensions would be granted. *Phillips*,
2 817 F. Supp. 2d at 1322-23. And there, the pro se plaintiff’s excuse did not justify
3 the delay. *See id.* at 1323 (“[A] lightning strike might serve as an excuse for one
4 day’s delay, but not three. . . . [and] he simply wanted more time to complete his
5 memoranda.”). Here, the length of delay is justified by Langadinos’s mother’s
6 hospital admission, and the Court has not yet warned that no further extensions
7 will be granted.

8 Accordingly, the Court GRANTS the requested extension and accepts
9 Langadinos’s reply filed May 30, 2024, Dkt. No. 59. Because Langadinos labeled his
10 reply “preliminary,” the Court finds it necessary to clarify that it will not accept any
11 additional replies filed by Langadinos with regard to his motion to amend. The
12 Court also cautions Langadinos to abide by the Federal and Local Rules of Civil
13 Procedure, including all court deadlines, to avoid the Court striking his responses
14 as untimely in the future.

15 Langadinos also claims that he “incorporates [in his reply] a Motion to Strike,
16 pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(f), numerous scandalous and erroneous arguments,
17 points, and legal authorities that [D]efendant WSBA filed in bad faith.” Dkt. No. 59
18 at 1. Other than conclusory statements describing Defendants’ case cites as
19 “erroneous” and “inapplicable,” Langadinos does not identify the portions of
20 Defendant’s briefings that he seeks to strike. *See generally id.* Accordingly, the
21 Court DENIES Langadinos’s motion to strike.
22
23

1 Dated this 30th day of May, 2024.

2
3 

4 Jamal N. Whitehead
5 United States District Judge
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23